

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **August 19, 2004**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-25 of the application. Claims 1-5, 13-14, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nakamura (USPN 6,633,873, hereinafter “Nakamura”). Claims 6-12, 14, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Harris (USPub 2002/0059204, hereinafter “Harris”).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 were rejected as being anticipated by Nakamura. Applicant respectfully points out that Nakamura teaches gathering response data from a remote device that satisfies predetermined conditions **based on a specific database** (see Nakamura, col. 2, lines 4-7 and col. 4, lines 44-45).

In contrast, the present invention filters search requests obtained from a remote supplier by **applying organization procurement controls** to filter the search results generated by the remote supplier (see page 6, lines 15-19 and page 12, lines 1-3 of the instant application—The problem is described at page 2, lines 1-6). This is beneficial because it maintains organizational procurement control (for example, specifying price or quantity limits) over search results generated by a remote supplier. There is nothing within Nakamura, either explicit or implicit, which suggests filtering search results from a remote supplier by applying organization procurement controls to search results generated by a remote supplier.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 to clarify that the present invention filters search requests by applying organization procurement controls to search results generated by a remote supplier. These amendments find support on page 6, lines 15-19 and on page 12, lines 1-3 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-13, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, and claims 24-25, which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: October 8, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665